

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the remarks set forth below. Claims 1-21 remain in the application. Claims 1, 12, 15 and 21 are amended, and claims 2-11, 13-14 and 16-20 remain unchanged.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,489,947) in view of Min et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,746 B1). Under U.S.C. § 103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (MPEP § 706.02(j)).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Cooper and Min et al. Claim 1 is amended to recite, inter alia, the step of "storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory, **each header containing the same memory location of the pixel map** and a unique display characteristic." Support for this amendment is found in the application on page 9, lines 14-17. Applicants respectfully propose that the references do not teach the image processing method of amended claim 1.

Specifically, as noted in the office action, although Cooper discloses a method for storing a pixel map and an associated header in a memory, Cooper fails to disclose storing a plurality of different headers associated with a pixel map in a memory. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention, as defined by amended claim 1, is neither taught nor suggested by Cooper.

Min et al. discloses storing a single global header, a plurality of local headers, and an associated pixel map image in a memory. (Col. 7, lns. 33-65). The global header and the plurality of local headers appear to contain *different memory locations* associated with different portions of the pixel map. More specifically, the global header contains the memory location of the entire pixel map and each local header contains a different memory location of a different region within the pixel map. (Col. 7, lns. 33-65; Fig. 7). Using this approach Min et al. teaches a process for displaying a pixel map having regions with different characteristics (e.g., highlights, size, color, and blend ratio). (Col 7, ln. 54 to Col. 8, ln 30; Figs. 7-10). It

should be noted that to change a pixel map characteristic using the teachings of Min et al., either data in the global header or data in at least one local header must be changed (i.e., rewritten).

In contrast to Min et al., the present invention, as defined by amended claim 1, recites "storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory, **each header containing the same memory location of the pixel map** and a unique display characteristic." This limitation is an important feature of Applicants' claimed invention since "storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory, **each header containing the same memory location of the pixel map** and a unique display characteristic" enables a system using the claimed invention to retrieve the desired pixel map and a header having the desired display characteristic from memory without having to rewrite the display characteristic of the header, as discussed in further detail on pages 9 and 10 of Applicants' application. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention, as defined by amended claim 1, is neither taught nor suggested by Min et al.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that Cooper and Min et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the "storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory, **each header containing the same memory location of the pixel map** and a unique display characteristic" limitation of amended claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 2-4, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 1, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 5, as amended, includes elements similar to the elements of amended independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed

that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 6-11, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 5, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 12, as amended, includes elements similar to the elements of independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 13-14, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 12, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 15, as amended, includes elements similar to the elements of independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 16-20, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 15, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 21, as amended, includes elements similar to the elements of independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as

well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (317) 587-4019, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Ser. No. 09/592,204



RCA 89,652

No fees, other than those discussed above, are believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Vincent E. Duffy

Reg. No. 39,964

Phone (317) 587-4019

Patent Operations
THOMSON multimedia Licensing, Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
August 9, 2004

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2004

Technology Center 2600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

8/9/04

date

Vincent E. Duffy